UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,293	10/14/2003	W. Todd Daniell	190250-1550	7097

38823 7590 12/05/2007
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/
AT&T Delaware Intellectual Property, Inc.
600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.
SUITE 1500
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994

EXAMINER	
HOANG, HIEU T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
12/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/686,293	**Applicant(s)** DANIELL, W. TODD	
	Examiner Hieu T. Hoang	**Art Unit** 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *29 and 35-58* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *29, 35-58* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/23/2007 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-28, 30-34 have been canceled.

3. Claims 29 and 35-58 are pending.

Response to Amendments

4. The objection of claim 45 and 46 has been withdrawn due to the amendment.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are moot in ground of new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 49-58 are rejected under U.S.C. 101 as the claimed invention is related to non-statutory subject matter. A computer readable medium comprising a tangible medium embodied with an embedded computer program, as defined in the specification as a magnetic, optical, electromagnetic, infrared medium..., or an optical fiber, an electrical connection having one or more wire, or paper medium (p. 19, [0068], these are tangible and capable of transporting computer codes), is non-statutory subject matter.

8. It is suggested that the applicant amend the claims to read: "a computer storage medium having stored thereon computer program codes that when executed by a computer cause the computer to perform," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 39-42, 48-52, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinkin (US 2005/0050150) in view of Goldman (US 2003/0233418).

11. For claim 39, Dinkin discloses a method for providing electronic messaging, comprising:

providing a plurality of detection approaches for detecting undesired email messages (fig. 6, 8 spam filters); and

providing access to each of the detection approaches from a single graphical interface control (fig. 6, control 8 spam filters on an interface), the single graphical user interface control enabling the user to activate and deactivate each of the plurality of detection mechanisms independently of one another in order to provide a desired level of protection from undesired electronic messages ([0122], activate or deactivate one or more filters independently).

Dinkin does not explicitly disclose wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms comprise at least three different detection mechanisms used to detect undesired electronic messages.

However, Goldman discloses wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms comprise at least three different detection mechanisms used to detect undesired electronic messages ([0039], filter module 24 filters out unsolicited e-mails by referencing sender's addresses, fig. 4, 3 schemes of authorizing sender's e-mails).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dinkin and Goldman to implement at least three spam detection mechanisms on a single interface of Dinkin to provide the user with a many choices to enhance his/her own spam filter.

12. For claims 40, Dinkin-Goldman discloses the invention as in claim 39. Dinkin-Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email message is not on a list of senders authorized by the user (Goldman, fig. 4, unconfirmed category includes any sender's address that has not been categorized as authorized, [0044] lines 19-23).

13. For claims 41, Dinkin-Goldman discloses the invention as in claim 39. Dinkin-Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email is on a list of unauthorized senders (Goldman, fig. 4, unauthorized category, [0052] lines 1-8).

14. For claims 42, Dinkin-Goldman discloses the invention as in claim 39. Dinkin-Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that detects an email message if the email message contains a textual content string that is on a list of unauthorized textual content strings (Goldman, [0006] lines 1-10).

15. Claims 49-52 are rejected for the same rationale given in claims 39-52 respectively.

16. For claims 48 and 58, Dinkin-Goldman further discloses the email client displays a particular undesired email message in a particular manner that is representative of the

particular detection mechanism that detected the particular undesired email message (Goldman, [0050], lines 19-26).

17. Claims 29, 35, 38, 43-45, 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinkin, Goldman, and further in view of Gordon et al. (US 6,732,157, hereafter Gordon).

18. For claim 29, Dinkin discloses an email filtering system comprising:

an electronic messaging client for viewing electronic messages addressed to a user, the electronic messaging client having a single graphical user interface control to provide, to the user, options for configuring each of a plurality of detection mechanisms that detect undesired electronic messages from incoming electronic messages retrieved for the user (fig. 6, a single user interface to configure a plurality of filters for spam filtering),

the single graphical user interface control enabling the user to activate and deactivate each of the plurality of detection mechanisms independently of one another in order to provide a desired level of protection from undesired electronic messages ([0122], activate or deactivate one or more filters independently)

wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms comprise at least three different detection mechanisms used to detect undesired electronic messages (fig. 6, 8 spam filters).

Dinkin does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms include first, second, and third detection mechanisms;

However, Goldman discloses:

wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms include:

a first detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email message is not on a list of senders authorized by the user (fig. 4, unconfirmed sender list, [0044] lines 19-23);

a second detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email is on a list of unauthorized senders (fig. 4, unauthorized sender list, [0052] lines 1-8);

a third detection mechanism that detects an email message if the email message contains a textual content string that is on a list of unauthorized textual content string ([0006] lines 1-10); and

Dinkin-Goldman does not disclose a fourth detection mechanism;

However, Gordon discloses:

a fourth detection mechanism that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; compare the content of an email message to the overall content and assign a score reflective of a level of similarity for the email message; and detect the email message if the score is higher than a designated score (col. 11, lines 16-32, Bayes filtering identifies words and/or groups of words representing spam in the content of the e-mail and determine a probability-a score of how likely the e-mail is a unwanted one, and compare the score with a user-defined threshold to filter the e-mail as unwanted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dinkin, Goldman and Gordon to implement at least three spam detection mechanisms on a single interface of Dinkin to provide the user with a many choices to enhance his/her own spam filter.

19. For claims 38, Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon further discloses the email client displays a particular undesired email message in a particular manner that is representative of the particular detection mechanism that detected the particular undesired email message (Goldman, [0050], lines 19-26).

20. For claims 43 and 53, Dinkin-Goldman discloses the invention substantially as claimed as described in claims 29 and 39, but fails to disclose the plurality of detection approaches include a approach that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; and detect an email message if the content of the message is similar to the overall content of the previous messages.

However, in the same art of undesired e-mail filtering, Gordon discloses the plurality of detection approaches include a approach that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; and detect an email message if the content of the message is similar to the overall content of the previous messages (col. 10, lines 53-61, col. 11 lines 16-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dinkin-Goldman and Gordon in order to filter undesired e-mails more effectively by using a combination of undesired e-mail filtering methods (authorized, unauthorized, text-based filtering etc., Gordon, col. 1 lines 53-56).

21. For claims 44 and 54, Dinkin-Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include:

- a first detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email message is not on a list of senders authorized by the user (Goldman, fig. 4, unconfirmed category includes any sender's address that has not been categorized as authorized, [0044] lines 19-23);
- a second detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email is on a list of unauthorized senders (Goldman, fig. 4, unauthorized category, [0052] lines 1-8);
- a third detection mechanism that detects an email message if the email message contains a textual content string that is on a list of unauthorized textual content string (Goldman, [0006] lines 1-10); and

Dinkin-Goldman does not disclose a forth detection mechanism.

However, Gordon discloses:

- a fourth detection mechanism that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; compare the content of an email message to the overall content and assign a score reflective of a level of similarity for the email message; and detect the email message if the score is higher than a designated score (col. 11, lines 16-32, Bayes filtering identifies words and/or groups of words representing spam in the content of the e-mail and determine a probability-a score of how likely the e-mail is a unwanted one, and compare the score with a user-defined threshold to filter the e-mail as unwanted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dinkin-Goldman and Gordon in order to filter undesired e-mails more effectively by using a combination of undesired e-mail filtering methods (authorized, unauthorized, text-based filtering etc., Gordon, col. 1 lines 53-56).

22. For claim 35, in addition to the rejection of claim 29, Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon further disclose the single graphical interface comprises:

- a first interface mechanism to access the first detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12, accessing and manipulating filtering information is activating detection mechanism);
- a second interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders authorized by the user (Goldman, [0045] lines 18-21, Gordon col. 9 lines 1-7);
- a third interface mechanism to activate the second detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12);

- a fourth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders not authorized by the user (Goldman, [0045] lines 18-21, Gordon, col. 9 lines 1-7);
- a fifth interface mechanism to access the third detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12);
- a sixth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings (Goldman, [0006] lines 1-10);
- a seventh interface mechanism to access the fourth detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12), and
- an eighth interface mechanism to adjust the designated score (Gordon, col. 12, lines 23-26, the threshold is defined by sliding an icon).
- Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon also discloses activating detection mechanisms (Dinkin, [0122], user can activate or deactivate each option button to select various levels of spam email filtering)

23. Claims 45 and 55 are rejected for the same rationale as claim 35.

24. Claims 36, 37, 46, 47, 56, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon as applied to claims 35, 45, 55 above, further in view of Gross et al. (US 6,782,510, hereafter Gross)

25. For claim 36, in addition to the rejection of claim 35, Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon further discloses a variety of visual mechanisms to represent the categorization of the sender. However, Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon does not explicitly disclose the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings is configured to display a list of the detected textual content strings in particular undesired email message that was detected by the third detection mechanism, the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings further configured to substitute different textual strings for the detected textual content strings.

In the same field of endeavor comprising electronic document word checking, Gross discloses the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings is configured to display a list of the detected textual content strings in particular undesired email message that was detected by the third detection mechanism (col. 8 lines 10-19, fig. 2 items 235 and 240, an alert is given to the user if there is a word that was predefined by the user as inappropriate (by using highlighting the words or other visual, audible warning or both)), the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings further configured to substitute different textual strings for the detected textual content strings (fig. 2 item 245, col. 8 lines 23-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dinkin-Goldman-Gordon with the teachings of Gross in order to provide the user with more functionality as to reduce the potential offensive words or sensitive words by substituting these words with words that have the same meaning but less offensive while maintaining appropriateness of the meaning of the word (Gross, col. 8 lines 29-31).

26. For claim 37, Gross further discloses the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings is configured to display a particular undesired email message with the detected textual content strings in the particular undesired email message highlighted so that the user may select a particular highlighted detected textual content string (col. 8 lines 10-19, fig. 2 items 235 and 240, an alert is given to the user if there is a word that was predefined by the user as inappropriate (by using highlighting the words or other visual, audible warning or both)), the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings being configured to remove the particular highlighted detected textual content string from the unauthorized list of textual content strings (col. 8 lines 25-44, the user can change the status field of the word to make it no more inappropriate in subsequent checks; in other words, the user can remove the word that he/she thinks appropriate from the inappropriate word list, fig. 2 items 250, 255).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldman, Gordon, and Kosco with the teachings of Gross in order to provide the user with more functionality as to reduce the potential offensive words or sensitive words by substituting these words with words that have the same meaning but less offensive while maintaining appropriateness of the meaning of the word (Gross, col. 8 lines 29-31).

27. Claim 46 and 56 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 36.

28. Claim 47 and 57 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 37.

Conclusion

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

12/2/07

HH